

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claim 1-6 and 10-18 are pending.
Claims 1-6 and 10-18 are rejected.
Claims 7-9 are canceled.

Claim 1 is amended in view of the various 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph rejections made to the claim (in view of antecedent basis problems) and the various claim objections made to Claim 1, also in the Office Action. Applicants have also added reference numerals to the claim (which are not limiting), as show the operation of the invention in the drawings.

The amendments to Claim 18 reflect these amendments to Claim 1, as well.

Claim 2 is amended for language.

Claim 5 is amended for language.

Claim 17 is amended to eliminate the multiple dependent form of the claim.

Figs. 1-3 are amended to recite "prior art", as request to by the Examiner. Additionally, Applicants assert that Claim 18 (as a means claim) is supported in the drawings as such a claim is derived from method Claim 1, where drawings and associated description meet the requirements under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a).

No new matter was entered in view of these amendments.

I. 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph Rejection

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-6 and 10-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner terms from Claim 1 which are now eliminated from the claim, where the

specification describes the construction of descriptor units which are stored in at least one memory buffer (specification, page 6, line 28 to page 7, line 27, and in other places. The claimed transfer step which is achieved when at least one memory buffer has reached a threshold is on page 7, lines 17-22, and in other places. The claimed reading of the recording medium is disclosed on page 8, lines 4-8, and in other places. The reading of the associated descriptor units from a second at least one buffer is supported in the specification on page 7, line 29 to page 8, lines 15, and in other places.

Additionally, the Applicants take issue with the Examiner's definition of 'description units' as being pre-existing memory spaces already in a memory buffer. This is incorrect, as the specification defines description units as not as a memory address in a buffer, but as a set of information (specification page 2, lines 16-19) which can be derived from the descriptor information associated with the syntaxes defined in the MPEG standard (see the specification, page 1, lines 21-30, and in other places).

That is, without amendment, the term description units are defined in the specification and are not mere memory spaces in the buffer (as characterized to by the Examiner). Applicants therefore request that the Examiner, if a further rejection is made to the claims, that the next action be a non-final rejection as no prior art was cited against these claims. Applicants believe this was the case because the Examiner's understanding of the term "description units" was a memory space in a buffer.

II. 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 as lacking an antecedent basis for various terms. As amended, the claim should have such problems eliminated.

In addition, the Applicants take note that the Examiner is incorrect about Claim 18 (before or after amendment) as being a single means claim. Regardless

of the status of Claim 18 before amendment, Claim 18 presently contains multiple means.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joel M. Fogelson/

By: Joel M. Fogelson

Reg. No. 43, 613

Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
September 15, 2008